

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2009

Attending: Keith Williams, Chair (UCD), David Kay, Vice-Chair (UCI), Constantin Teleman (UCB), John Yoder (UCD) (telephone), David Pan (UCI), Jack Vevea (UCM), David Funder (UCR), Sherrel Howard (UCLA), Gerardo Aldana (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), James Levin (UCSD), Jamel Velji (Graduate Student Representative), Dan Greenstein (Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination) (telephone), Hilary Baxter (Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination), Dan Simmons (Academic Senate Vice Chair), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst)

I. Announcements

The Chair described the fee increases for undergraduate and graduate students. The fees for graduate students will create hardships for the faculty they work for since the increases are not built into grants. There were student protests at campuses and at the Regents meeting. Council released a memo about the protests expressing concerns that they should not get out of hand. UCEP's undergraduate representative played a key role in speaking to students at his campus. The president and Regents have been the focus of protests and students are being encouraged to redirect the protests towards the legislature. The income limit for the Blue and Gold program has been raised to \$70,000.

The UC budget is a major issue and UC will ask the state for \$900 million more. The goal is still to end the furloughs at the end of August, but there are discussions about extending furloughs for state workers. The UC Commission on the Future's listening tour has been useful and the workgroups provide reports. The public comments have focused on complaints about fee increases or union issues. Chair Williams has had useful discussions with faculty outside of those forums. The workgroups' recommendations will go to the Commission, then to the Senate for formal review and to the Regents following the review. The plan is for the workgroups to have two or three recommendations ready in March and then discuss other issues for several months after that deadline. By 2025, 40% of the jobs will require a bachelors degree while only 35% of adults will have one, which makes a strong case for higher education. The former secretary of labor, Robert Reich, discussed the need for a focus on the public good at a recent Commission hearing.

Chair Williams has been at several meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). A subgroup of ICAS has reviewed the Master Plan and found it to be relevant but without funding. A state legislative committee is also reviewing the Master Plan and the chair of this committee, Ira Ruskin, attended the December 4th ICAS meeting and discussed the importance of talking about the benefits and value of higher education. The committee will have four more hearings in the next several months. ICAS is working on advocacy efforts which will involve students and students will also have a rally in Sacramento in March. ICAS will develop a position statement that aims to help the legislature better understand higher education.

Discussion: A member indicated that his campus is preparing to absorb a 15% budget cut and another is facing a 10% cut. At another campus, at least one major is being restricted to only students in that major and students at another campus are not getting into required courses. The Committee on Courses at one campus learned that there is no official policy on limiting courses

to students in the major and that the decision is left to the departments. Students unable to get into required courses will not graduate on time and campuses should be asked to track this issue. There is also a concern about the number of students unable to complete their major due to the fee increases. UCEP may want to further discuss this issue at a future meeting, especially the question of departmental autonomy. A distinction might be made between upper division courses and lower division courses where access should be broader. Several campuses have developed committees that are looking at curriculum and budget issues. There are discussions about substituting courses for the required courses students cannot get into. Medical school requirements limit the flexibility of the life sciences with respect to substituting courses. This issue will be discussed by the Education and Curriculum workgroup of the UC Commission on the Future.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The committee approved the minutes with one correction.

III. Report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force

Comments on this report are due January 4, 2009.

Discussion: UCEP should state that the CLA should not be used in the short term. As each department develops learning objectives they should be posted so that other departments can borrow the ones they like. A member reported that there was disagreement based on disciplines about using a quantifiable assessment. The argument was that the Arts and Humanities do not have rubrics that would enable them to conduct assessments. It was noted that the UEETF report does not mention grades, and Chair Williams indicated that grades have been determined to be inadequate markers. WASC has indicated that more objective measures than grades are needed. An issue is whether a parallel system independent from grades needs to be established and how grades are formulated needs to be described. WASC wants an explanation of the skills that have been mastered rather than just a grade. Last year a member attended a helpful meeting for faculty from his discipline across campuses focused on program objectives. OP provided the funding for the meeting and Academic Planning has requested funding to conduct the meetings again. Grades or other learning outcome measures may not necessarily measure what faculty actually want students to learn.

UCEP should endorse having assessments but that creating measures that allow for comparisons should be avoided. UCEP should also state that the more general tests now available like the CLA should not be used at this time, noting that there have been negative consequences in the K12 system as a result of standardized testing. Program review should be emphasized. Improvement of the program should be the goal, not public accountability. The emphasis could be on the existing standardized forms of assessment. Tracking where alumni go might be an objective measure and the letter may also support surveys of graduates. UCEP could also point out how departments can make better use of grades. The report focuses on accountability without defining what accountability means. There should be mechanisms for rewarding faculty for looking critically at their programs. The letter should note that adequate funding is needed and highlight the workload issues involved.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft a letter for the committee's review.

IV. Final Report of the 2008-09 Task Force on the Education Abroad Program

One of the UCEP representatives on the EAP Governing Board reported that at the second board meeting it was decided that the EAP director would be a tenured faculty member with administrative experience. The possible closure of Russia, Hungary and Siena programs was discussed. The program in Russia will probably be kept open, the program in Hungary has serious issues and the Siena program has a large budget deficit. The director of the Siena program has been asked to propose strategies to change the structure of the program in order to save money and the program will be closed if no strategies are identified. The budget model selected was the second option which relies heavily on student fees and provides limited state funds to EAP.

Discussion: The Governing Board is providing better oversight than was available in the past, but the authority of the Board needs to be clarified. OP decided on the budget for EAP and the Governing Board did not discuss it during the first meeting although faculty asserted that the program should be treated and funded like an academic program. The Board does have input into which programs will close and how to make the programs operate more cost effectively. There has not been a decision about moving the UOEAP office to a campus. The Board voted that it will have the authority to increase the EAP fee. There has been no further discussion about differential fees, the highest of which is \$4000 for Hebrew University. The Board was told that the fees will be subject to return to aid although if the fees reach a certain level there may not be return to aid on that extra portion. There is an across the board EAP fee and there may be a second fee for certain programs that cost more. There is the potential for the fees to be increased at will to generate revenue. UC is still getting state money for students in EAP but it appears that EAP is not getting this funding. There is a savings when students are in EAP but it is unclear where the savings are being captured. A language department at one campus has expressed concerns that students who need immersion into a language through EAP may not be able to afford increased fees.

The articulation process is being done both before and after the student goes abroad and there are discussions about eliminating the first approval. An alternative procedure for getting information about the courses to the students and approving the courses is needed given the potential problems if the courses are not approved when the student returns. UCEP might suggest that a task force is set up to look at registration issues. UCEP could suggest that the universities abroad provide the syllabus in advance so that UC can determine if the course meets UC requirements. The process used for students transferring from the community colleges might be a model for how EAP courses are approved although this is a costly process. The term of Board membership needs to be clarified because the charge indicates that it is for three years, whereas the UCEP representatives on the Board understood their appointments were for one and two years. The report does not fully explain the recommendation to move UOEAP to a campus, although one reason given is to establish relationships with departments at a campus. It has also been suggested that the office be moved to OP.

Action: The chair will draft a letter to Council.

V. Report of Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency

Comments on the Online and Remote Instruction and Residency Report are due January 15, 2009.

Discussion: The definition of residency still needs to be clarified. A mechanism should be in place to verify that the students taking the exam are the ones who have taken the course. Online courses will have different qualities from in person courses and this should be considered. Students may need to be required to take exams in person. The report should more clearly state that faculty teaching an online course need to have different skills. A member commented that students have stopped attending lectures when they are available in podcasts. UCEP might suggest that faculty should be encouraged to provide a hybrid course to supplement the online component. A strong evaluation component should be in place to determine the effectiveness of the courses. Chair Williams described the findings from various reports on the effectiveness of online courses. The task force report asks whether faculty should be certified by the campuses to teach an online instruction. It is not clear that UC would know how to provide certifications but faculty should be provided with sufficient support to conduct the course. UCEP could state that online courses should be looked at in the context of using technology in instruction as opposed to cost savings. A hybrid course provides interaction with the faculty member and the online component would address the issue of lectures with large numbers of students. Whether a course with an online lab component will have a different course designation from the same course without the online lab should be clarified. The point was made that online courses might be used to ensure that students have access to required courses to help them graduate on time. The committee discussed whether online courses will alleviate the issue with a lack of teaching assistants. UC could examine transfer students from the community colleges who took online courses and the equivalent courses in person to gather data on the effectiveness of online courses. The task force report will help shape Academic Planning's online education initiative. There is general approval of the report but there are some areas of concern.

Action: The chair and analyst will draft a letter for the committee's review.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning Analyst, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

Analyst Baxter mentioned a recent report from the Legislative Analyst's Office and the committee analyst provided a link to the committee.

VII. Days of Instruction

Discussion: Members commented that defining days of instruction could result in unforeseen problems. The committee discussed whether the number of days of instruction should be reduced. UCB created five days for student review during which there are no traditional classes or lectures and no new material can be introduced. The analyst will locate the bylaw that outlines hours of availability.

VIII. Education and Curriculum Workgroup Issues

Discussion: UC quality comes from the quality of the faculty who are teaching and conducting research. UC students are another part of the quality. A member suggested removing the reference to online courses in a document Chair Williams provided and another suggested expanding on the point about being a land grant university. UC is unique from other research universities because it is a ten campus system. The location of UC results in students having connections to businesses and another benefit is California's proximity to the Pacific Rim. The list can be grouped into three areas – what characterizes UC, what students take away, and

course design and evaluation. The impact that UC has more broadly on the state and nation including alumni in leadership positions should be emphasized.

IX. Revising the UCEP Bylaw

Chair Williams described the concerns about the revised bylaw proposed earlier in the year.

Discussion: The proposal to change the bylaw resulted from the fact there is no systemwide committee that looks at student welfare issues. Members discussed concerns about the committee workload if UCEP is asked to consider student welfare.

Action: The committee will send the analyst information about committees on the campuses that handle student welfare issues.

X. UC Online Education Initiative

- *Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

The committee reviewed a document prepared by Academic Planning for potential donors describing the UC Online Education Initiative.

Discussion: The role of faculty in online courses should be clarified. Vice Provost Greenstein indicated that feedback from faculty suggested that a number of roles are appropriate depending on the type of course being offered, but the intent is for only UC faculty to design and deliver the courses. Phases five and six represent the ways that content could eventually be used. A member remarked that the focus should be on the quality of UC education as opposed to areas that UC could move into such as offering an AA degree. The committee discussed the potential efficiencies associated with offering online courses. A CEP at one campus supports a pilot project but has concerns about offering a BA and about whether Senate's authority over course content is being overlooked. The issue of access for international students was discussed. The Vice Provost noted that online courses would help address the issue of access to courses that are overenrolled. UC is asking whether there is a demand for selective online education. Other questions include whether a quality education can be delivered online. Phase six could offer courses to UC alumni. Phase two could pose the question of whether an online degree could be offered and potential opportunities could be identified as a next step. The resources put into online courses are the same as those put into traditional in person courses. The Vice Provost reported that faculty have objected to the idea of a cybercampus. One committee member recommended that the proposal should be more open ended and have multiple potential paths. The request for pre-proposals will be issued within the next few weeks and faculty would have four or five weeks to respond. There is no money set aside for the initiative now. More information about the types of students who would be prohibited from attending an existing UC campus is needed. Faculty would retain the intellectual property rights to the courses they develop. Faculty would also determine how frequently the courses need to be refreshed.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Keith Williams